

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 2, 4-28 and 30-33 are pending in the application, with 1, 12, 16, 17, 24, 26, 27, and 32 being the independent claims. Claims 1, 4, 5, 12, 16, 17, 24, 26, 27 and 32 are presently amended. Claims 3 and 29 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to FIG. 1 under MPEP § 608.02(g) as depicting prior art without being designated as prior art. A replacement drawing in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) is submitted herewith for consideration.

The Examiner has objected to FIG. 7A, FIG. 7C, and FIG. 7D under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) as including reference characters not mentioned in the description. Reference characters 710, 712, 718, 720, 754, 756, 774, 776, 778, and 780 have been removed and replacement drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are submitted for consideration.

The Examiner has objected to FIG. 2, FIG. 5, and FIG. 8 under 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) as including reference characters not mentioned in the description. The

specification has been amended accordingly to mention reference characters 216, 526, and 808.

None of the foregoing changes introduce new matter. Based on these changes, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner has objected to the specification because of a missing serial number in paragraph 0001. An amendment to paragraph 0001 of the specification is submitted for consideration.

The Examiner has further objected to the specification due to typographical errors in paragraph 0040 and 0057. Amendments to paragraph 0040 and 0057 of the specification are submitted for consideration.

None of the foregoing changes introduce new matter. Based on these changes, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to the specification be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 12, 17-19, 24, 27 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by International Publication No. WO 00/27092 to Eicon Technology Corporation ("Eicon").

Independent claims 1, 12, 17, 24, and 27 are currently amended. Applicants respectfully submit that Eicon does not teach or suggest the features of independent claims 1, 12, 17, 24, and 27. Specifically, Eicon nowhere teaches or suggests "loading the cache with a preliminary set of domain names and corresponding IP addresses ... wherein the preliminary set of domain names and corresponding IP addresses represent a

selected set of addresses to which the customer premises equipment is entitled to have access."

Since Eicon does not teach or suggest the features of independent claims 1, 12, 17, 24, and 27, it cannot anticipate the claims. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 12, 17, 24, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn. Furthermore, dependent claims 2, 18-19, and 28 are also not anticipated by Eicon for at least the same reasons as the independent claim from which they depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 2, 12, 17-19, 24, 27, and 28 is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 16, 26, and 32

The Examiner has rejected claims 16, 26, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Eicon.

Independent claims 16, 26, and 32 are currently amended. Applicants respectfully submit that Eicon does not render obvious the features of independent claims 16, 26, and 32. Specifically, Eicon nowhere teaches or suggests "loading the cache with a preliminary set of domain names and corresponding IP addresses ... wherein the preliminary set of domain names and corresponding IP addresses represent a selected set of addresses to which the customer premises equipment is entitled to have access."

Since Eicon does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of independent claims 16, 26, and 32, it cannot render obvious those claims. Accordingly, the

Examiner's rejection of claims 16, 26, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 3-5 and 29

The Examiner has rejected claims 3-5 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Eicon in view of U.S. Patent 6,262,987 to Mogul ("Mogul").

Claims 3 and 29 are cancelled by the current amendment. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 3 and 29 is rendered moot.

Claims 4 and 5 depend from independent claim 1. As set forth above, Eicon does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 1. Mogul does not supply the missing teaching or suggestion. Thus, the combination of Eicon and Mogul cannot render claim 1 obvious. Claims 4 and 5 are likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Eicon and Mogul for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 from which they depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 22, 23, 25, 30, 31, and 33

The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 22, 23, 25, 30, 31, and 33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Eicon in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0012147 to Buckman *et al.* ("Buckman").

Claims 6, 7, 9, and 10 depend from independent claim 1. As set forth above, Eicon does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 1. Buckman does not supply the missing teaching or suggestion. Thus, the combination of Eicon and Buckman cannot render claim 1 obvious. Claims 6, 7, 9, and 10 are likewise

not rendered obvious by the combination of Eicon and Buckman for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 from which they depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 6, 7, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 13 and 14 depend from independent claim 12. As set forth above, Eicon does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 12. Buckman does not supply the missing teaching or suggestion. Thus, the combination of Eicon and Buckman cannot render claim 12 obvious. Claims 13 and 14 are likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Eicon and Buckman for at least the same reasons as independent claim 12 from which they depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 22 and 23 depend from independent claim 17. As set forth above, Eicon does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 17. Buckman does not supply the missing teaching or suggestion. Thus, the combination of Eicon and Buckman cannot render claim 17 obvious. Claims 22 and 23 are likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Eicon and Buckman for at least the same reasons as independent claim 17 from which they depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 25 depends from independent claim 24. As set forth above, Eicon does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 24. Buckman does not supply the missing teaching or suggestion. Thus, the combination of Eicon and Buckman cannot render claim 24 obvious. Claim 25 is likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Eicon and Buckman for at least the same reasons as independent claim 24 from which it depends and further in view of its own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 30 and 31 depend from independent claim 27. As set forth above, Eicon does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 27. Buckman does not supply the missing teaching or suggestion. Thus, the combination of Eicon and Buckman cannot render claim 27 obvious. Claims 30 and 31 are likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Eicon and Buckman for at least the same reasons as independent claim 27 from which they depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 30 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 33 depends from independent claim 32. As set forth above, Eicon does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 32. Buckman does not supply the missing teaching or suggestion. Thus, the combination of Eicon and Buckman cannot render claim 32 obvious. Claim 33 is likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Eicon and Buckman for at least the same reasons as independent claim 32 from which it depends and further in view of its own respective features.

Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 11, and 15

The Examiner has rejected claims 8, 11, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Eicon in view of Buckman and further in view of RFC 1035 "Domain Names - Implementation and Specification" to Mockapetris ("RFC 1035").

Claims 8 and 11 depend from independent claim 1. As set forth above, Eicon does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 1. Buckman and RFC 1035 do not supply the missing teaching or suggestion. Thus, the combination of Eicon, Buckman, and RFC 1035 cannot render claim 1 obvious. Claims 8 and 11 are likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Eicon, Buckman, and RFC 1035 for at least the same reasons as independent claim 1 from which they depend and further in view of their own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claims 8 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 15 depends from independent claim 12. As set forth above, Eicon does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 12. Buckman and RFC 1035 do not supply the missing teaching or suggestion. Thus, the combination of Eicon, Buckman, and RFC 1035 cannot render claim 12 obvious. Claim 15 is likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Eicon, Buckman, and RFC 1035 for at least the same reasons as independent claim 12 from which it depends and further in view of its own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 15 under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 20

The Examiner has rejected claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Eicon in view of "Practical Internet" to Kasser ("Kasser").

Claim 20 depends from independent claim 17. As set forth above, Eicon does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 17. Kasser does not supply the missing teaching or suggestion. Thus, the combination of Eicon and Kasser cannot render claim 17 obvious. Claim 20 is likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Eicon and Kasser for at least the same reasons as independent claim 17 from which it depends and further in view of its own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 21

The Examiner has rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Eicon in view of "Sams Teach Yourself PCs in 24 Hours" to Perry ("Perry").

Claim 21 depends from independent claim 17. As set forth above, Eicon does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claim 17. Perry does not supply the missing teaching or suggestion. Thus, the combination of Eicon and Perry cannot render claim 17 obvious. Claim 21 is likewise not rendered obvious by the combination of Eicon and Perry for at least the same reasons as independent claim 17 from which it depends and further in view of its own respective features. Accordingly, the Examiner's

rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is traversed and Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.


Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Thomas C. Fiala
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 43,610

Date: September 29, 2005

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

446312_2.DOC